

A Minor Example And A Mild Amusement On Cold Winter Evenings:

Lurking On Social Media

While lurking on a new social media platform (an alternative to Twitter/X) I came across a debate - or argy-bargy as one of the two persons involved called it - about the O9A. The gist was whether as one side stated there was an ONA 1.0 and, post-1992, an O9A 2.0 [1][2] and whether O9A 2.0 was a Frankensteinian monster which was dead and buried as the Seven Oxonians et al affirmed. [3] The other (anonymous) side somewhat vehemently denied this claiming not only that the O9A was still around but, among other things, that whatever some self-declared O9A adherent wrote or said about the O9A was a "primary O9A source".

sirida21.bsky.social @sirida21.bsky.social · 13h

↩ Reply to you

This does nothing to address my argument. They are in no position to claim it dead, such a statement is just that, a statement, an opinion contradicted by O9A adherents still existing. It cannot be declared "dead" by one group, nor multiple, if there are adherents to its philosophy it is alive.

The 'they' in this screenshot are the Seven Oxonians:

oxfordian23.bsky.social @oxfordian23.bsky.social · 9s

First, one has to define what that occult movement is or what it was, and why, citing primary sources. Second, what are its primary sources and who defines what they are. Third, what is an "adherent" and who defines who is. That is what they wrote about between 2021 and 2023. Where is your research?

The items between 2021 and 2023 included the 44 page compilation *O9A: The Importance Of Primary Sources*, [3] and *Analysing The Order Of Nine Angles*. [4]

oxfordian23.bsky.social @oxfordian23.bsky.social · now

Apparently you misunderstand what a primary source is especially in relation to a certain esoteric movement, failing to answer through research what that movement/philosophy was and then became after that stupid 'authority of individual judgment' was introduced. That person made a serious mistake.

An example of the lack of research into the ONA by the pro-O9A person is evident in this:

1.0 and 2.0 is an abstraction and seems to deviate from the manuscripts. Even if it was not explicit satanism it had Satan as a spiritual entity ("Dark God") that the practitioner had to work alongside. Re:"primary sources" as I just responded, not useful re:ONA because it cannot be applied narrowly

The person had thus failed to read the *Satanism And Naos* section of chapter titled *The Sinisterly-Numinous Occult Tradition* in the 44 page 2023 compilation *O9A: The Importance Of Primary Sources* where it is explained that:

"The Seven Fold Way as described in Naos is devoid of satanism both theological and ritual. Satan is mentioned in Part Two, Esoteric Sorcery; that is, in regard to the practical 'External Magick/Sorcery' associated in the Seven Fold Way with the second stage, that of External Adept. The context is the Occult vibration of names 'to create or 'draw down' a particular force or entity in a magickal working, with satan thus associated with the second septenary sphere, Mercury [...] In this guise, 'satan' is one of many archetypes - or supernatural entities - employed in External Magick [...]"

Satan/Shaitan is thus conceived as a type of energy associated with, or which symbolizes, human lust and indulgence and does not have any superiority among the 'dark gods' described in Naos, with Atazoth described as the most powerful of the Dark Gods and Shaitan stated to be 'an' - not 'the' - Earth bound representative for the Dark Gods." [3]

Thus in Naos, the foundational text of the ONA Seven Fold Way and of ONA 1.0, Satanism as *raison d'etre* does not

exist either as defined by Aquino and/or Howard Stanton Levey, or as antinomian posing, for it is just one minor experience of the sorcery appropriate to the stage of External Adept which stage only lasts between 12 and 18 months. [5]

This speaks for itself:

sirida21.bsky.social

Secondly, what constitutes an adherent ("member") is very obvious, it entails following one of the ways of the ONA. The currently explicated options are the Way of the Rounwytha, the Way of the Drecc/Niner, and the Sevenfold Way, I would also include the Hebdomian Way in this, and maybe some others.

oxfordian23.bsky.social @oxfordian23.bsky.social · now

Primary sources are primary sources. What others write about that movement/ideology/group are secondary sources. There's still the question of what is that 'movement', 1.0 re Naos which was sans satanism; or 2.0 after his gross error in introducing stuff like that non-hermetic Labyrinthos thingy.

Open Source Software For Human Beings

Another spat concerned ONA 1.0 as open source software for human beings:

The notion of that esoteric movement being open source software for human beings dates back to 2009 and was, for example, mentioned in a 2014 text; in a 2019 301 page compilation and an item dated January 2024 as well as in that 2023 interview. It seems few bother to do any basic research.

"The saga of the Order of Nine Angles (O9A, ONA) between the 1970s and 2018 could be understood as a metaphor for how esotericism, or more specially esoteric philosophy, is or can be presented in this era of Mass Media and the Internet (i) when individuals with little or no knowledge of an esoteric philosophy can, mostly anonymously, claim to be or self-declare they are followers of or associated with that philosophy, and (ii) when others such as journalists and even academics commit knowingly or unknowingly the fallacy of non causa pro causa by assuming without question that these claimants and usually their deeds or beliefs are representative of or presence that philosophy when in reality there is no causal connection.

If it is accepted, as O9A primary sources indicate, that what we - using an example from Open Source software - may call O9A 1.0 was an original esoteric philosophy then what developed or was interpreted post-1992 by others self-declaring as O9A was a 'fork' of the tools and source code contained in O9A 1.0 just as the 'tools', the source code, of the GNU Project became the basis for several other distributions of Open Source software.

Or considered more simply, Anton Long's original esoteric philosophy was an Open Source set of esoteric 'tools' which he made freely and publicly available under a 'copyleft' license thus allowing others to use those tools and develop them. Among these 'tools' were The Star Game, The Septenary Tree Of Wyrð with its pathways and occult correspondences; Esoteric Chant; the ontology of Causal And Acausal; Aeonic Theory; and the Grade Rituals of External Adept, Internal Adept and The Abyss." The Metaphorical O9A. [8]

A Moral Decision

oxfordian23.bsky.social @oxfordian23.bsky.social · 19m

[1/2] As explained in their A Moral Dilemma text, one of their principal reasons for junking that esoteric movement was a moral one, writing that "its moral defects render it unsuitable as a modern practical guide to Lapis Philosophicus." Another reason given in another text was:

Among the aspects of Longusian Occultism {2} that the developers of the new esoteric tradition considered to be, based on their experience and learning, unnecessary for or no longer relevant in a hermetic pursuit of Lapis Philosophicus were:

- (i) the japes, deceptions, and the trickery presented by Anton Long's Labyrinthos Mythologicus;
- (ii) Occult rituals and ceremonies in general, and all types of sorcery;
- (iii) Insight Roles;
- (iv) the causal abstractions and dialectic involved in supporting or using for whatever reason political forms such as National Socialism;
- (v) Satanism, however defined or presented;
- (vi) the complexity of Anton Long's labyrinthine esoteric philosophy; (vii) the goal of seeking to presence a New Aeon and to change what-is - such as society or societies - by any means including but not limited to means which are or which can be classified as political, religious, ideological, social, mythological or Occult.

The Ending

The debate ended with the pro-O9A person merely repeating their claims and assumptions:

sirida21.bsky.social

What a nice delineation. Regardless, your definitions of "primary sources" as I have stated numerous times are arbitrary, as is a supposed distinction between ONA 1.0 and 2.0, and you have used multiple fallacies such as a motte and bailey argument, claiming to be opinion, then using it as binding.

and thus yet again ignoring such reasonable explanations as these, from *Fairness, Fallacies, And The Cræft Of Research*. [9]

The civilized rule, the fair thing to do, was that unless a person had done their own research using primary source material or had personal direct contemporaneous experience of an event or had extensive personal experience of a group, or personally knew a person over an extended period of time, then they reserved their judgment and did not venture forth, did not publicly give, their opinion. In respect of a person, accused of something or the subject of rumours, they gave them the benefit of the doubt until probative evidence proved otherwise.

However, in this era of Mass Media, of social media, of weblogs, internet websites and forums, this civilized rule is at best deprecated and at worst ignored or not applied often because of ignorance or because of a propagandistic desire to defame a person or a group, with fallacies such as Ad Populum now the general rule instead.

Primary sources include contemporaneous manuscripts, letters, diaries, memoirs, personal journals, interviews, speeches, and other materials individuals used to describe (i) events in which they were participants or observers, and (ii) ideas or creations - such as a philosophy, music, literature, or art-work - which they were responsible for. Hence in the matter of a philosophy such as that of Heidegger the primary sources are his published writings, authenticated recordings or transcriptions of his speeches/lectures, and authenticated unpublished manuscripts if any. The writings, opinions, and conclusions of others about that philosophy, and other translations of his work, are secondary sources, with compilations of quotations from such secondary sources, a tertiary source. {4}

Hence the following response by the opponent of the phantasy that the O9A is not dead, still has self-declared adherents, and that primary sources re O9A are whatever such self-declared adherents write or say.

oxfordian23.bsky.social @oxfordian23.bsky.social · now

More blah blah blah. Your views, my views, their views. Millennial (Aeonic) perspective applies. In that perspective what became the now dead Frankensteinian monster (2.0) is irrelevant. Like I said, good riddance to that now dead and buried immoral monster. Your necromancy won't change things.

Conclusion

It seems that some individuals are determined, for whatever reason and from whatever motive, to publicly propagate on social media and elsewhere the phantasy that the O9A is still alive; that it did not become a Frankensteinian monster after 1992 due to going public via the internet and due to its axiom of individual judgment; and perhaps most silly of all that 'Anton Long' (the original or a clone) did not make severe mistakes by introducing that axiom; by going public; by introducing the Labyrinthos Mythologicus (Lab M); by moving away from the tradition of being clandestine and of only recruiting individuals privately; and by introducing categories such as 'niners' and 'dreccs'.

In effect, and partly because of the axiom of 'the authority of individual judgment' the O9A became a Frankensteinian monster, beyond the control of its creator because those who even if they used ONA primary sources to condemn the

interpretation of others, especially those self-identifying with the O9A, were considered as having no authority with their views thus regarded as just their own interpretation of O9A philosophy and which views could therefore be ignored. As occurred during the aforementioned social media argy-bargy.

Haereticus Reputandus
January 2024

===

[1]

You obviously missed what 'that person' said in 2023, re screenshot. That esoteric movement was akin to open source software 'for human beings' version 1.0. It later became forked as such software does, hence 2.0 which should have had its own brand name, qv Debian and Ubuntu.

As 'Anton Long' noted in that 2023 interview:

"I would agree that those writings of mine define a particular and possibly unique esoteric philosophy that I developed between the 1970s and the 1990s but with the caveat that that particular esoteric philosophy was only a beginning - ONA 1.0 if you will - and was open to being developed, changed, evolved, 'forked', in the manner of Open Source software, with such 'forked' software renamed accordingly. ONA 1.0 was described in the Naos MSS collection, 1989; in the Deofel Quartet, written between 1976 and 1991, and in the two volumes of *The Satanic Letters*." {7}

The operative term is "renamed accordingly" since the implication seems to be that such 'forked' developments are no longer O9A and should therefore be distinctly named and have their own identity.

<https://archive.org/download/anton-long-interview-2023/anton-long-interview-2023.pdf>

[2] qv. the Preface to *The O9A And The Longusian Esoteric Tradition*, <https://archive.org/download/o9a-and-longusian-occultism-2024/o9a-and-longusian-occultism-2024.pdf>

[3] O9A: The Importance Of Primary Sources, <https://archive.org/download/sources-overview/sources-overview.pdf>

[4] *Analysing The Order Of Nine Angles*, <https://archive.org/download/o9a-colin/2024-o9a-colin.pdf>

[5] Included in *The O9A And The Longusian Esoteric Tradition*, <https://archive.org/download/o9a-and-longusian-occultism-2024/o9a-and-longusian-occultism-2024.pdf>

[5] qv. Part Four: The Admonitions Of Anton Long, chapter Four of *Deconstructing The O9A*, which is included in <https://archive.org/download/noema-of-o9a/noema-of-o9a.pdf>

"Apart from the Labyrinthos Mythologicus and the axiom of the authority of individual judgment, contributing factors to the O9A becoming a Frankensteinian monster were the use of the Internet to distribute O9A texts and those who, mostly via the Internet and often anonymously, claimed to be associated with the O9A or self-described themselves as O9A, some of who also claimed to belong to or, like Sutter, to have founded an O9A chapter, cell, or nexion. In this milieu the admonitions of Anton Long, in primary sources, went unheeded or were overlooked."

[6] qv. *Satanism And Naos* in *O9A: The Importance Of Primary Sources*, <https://archive.org/download/sources-overview/sources-overview.pdf>

[7] qv. *The Black Book Of Satan And The Sinister-Numinous* in the chapter *Another Academic Misunderstanding?* in the compilation *O9A: The Importance Of Primary Sources*, op. cit.

[8] <https://archive.org/download/the-metaphorical-o-9-a/The-Metaphorical-O9A.pdf>

[9] <https://archive.org/download/fairness-and-fallacies/fairness-and-fallacies.pdf>